

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/002,224	KOTANI, TAKUYA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fred I. Ehichioya	2162	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Fred I. Ehichioya.

 (3) Carol Quinn (Reg. No. 39,000).

 (2) Leonard P. Diana (Reg. No. 29,296).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 12 May 2005
**Time:** 2:00 PM
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

*Amendments to independent claims and dependent claims*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner called Mr. Leonard P. Diana (Attorney of record) who amended the claims and familiar with the prosecution of this case to discuss the current amendment to independent claims, some dependent claims and Claim objection (allowable subject matter) of claims 6 - 12 and 18 - 24 of the previous Office Action; but Mr. Diana transferred the Examiner to Ms. Quinn. The Examiner was not sure if Ms. Quinn is familiar with the prosecution of this case; however, the examiner expresses his concerns about the amendment to claim 1 and other independent claims which are base claims to the Objected claims 6 - 12 and 18 - 24 with Ms. Quinn. The original recitations have been deleted from all the amended independent claims. The reason the Examiner objected to claims 6 - 12 and 18 - 24 for allowable subject matter is to incorporate the limitations of the independent (base) claims into the objected claims. Ms. Quinn does not see it necessary to include the limitations of the base claims and thought the case is allowable as amended during a discussion with the Examiner. The Examiner does not agree with Ms. Quinn and thinks the case is not allowable as amended without including the limitations of the base claims. The Examiner also suggests to Ms. Quinn in addition to including the limitations of the base claims, to include the limitations of claim 11 to the amended claim 1 and do the same to the amended independent claims to speed the allowance of this case, but Ms. Quinn declines. The Examiner therefore concludes to consult with his immediate supervisor and get back with Ms. Quinn either by telephone or next Office Action.